



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/695,217	10/28/2003	Ludomir A. Budzyn	B-1	4967
7590 10/23/2006 Ludomir A. Budzyn 7 Edgewood Place Maplewood, NJ 07040			EXAMINER WASSUM, LUKE S	
			ART UNIT 2167	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 10/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/695,217

**Applicant(s)**

BUDZYN, LUDOMIR A.

**Examiner**

Luke S. Wassum

**Art Unit**

2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. The Applicant's amendment, filed 15 September 2006, has been received, entered into the record, and considered.
2. As a result of the amendment, claims 1, 13 and 14 have been amended. Claims 1-16 remain pending in the application.

### *The Invention*

3. The claimed invention is a method for investigating intellectual property related to a reference piece of intellectual property. In one embodiment, the user inputs a trademark, and the system generates a list of patents and patent applications which are related in some way to said trademark.

### *Priority*

4. The Applicant's claim to domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) based upon U.S. Provisional Patent Application 60/421,710, filed 28 October 2002, is acknowledged.

*Drawings*

5. The application includes informal (hand drawn) drawings. While these drawings are acceptable for examination purposes, the examiner encourages the Applicant to submit formal drawings at the earliest opportunity. Early submission of formal drawings will help expedite post-allowance processing and publication of the issued patent.

*Claim Objections*

6. In view of the amendment to claims 13 and 14, the examiner withdraws the pending claim objections.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101*

7. In view of the amendment to claim 1, the examiner withdraws the pending rejections to claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2167

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee (U.S. Patent 6,694,331).

10. Regarding claim 1, Lee teaches a method for investigating intellectual property related to a user inputted reference piece of intellectual property as claimed, said method comprising:

- a) providing a first database of discrete pieces of first intellectual property, said pieces of first intellectual property each including an associated set of first characteristics (see disclosure that the system supports the analysis of different types of intellectual property information, such as patents, trademarks, copyrights, trade secrets, etc., col. 1, lines 16-22; see also col. 10, lines 34-40; see also col. 11, line 63 through col. 12, line 7);
- b) providing a second database of discrete pieces of second intellectual property, said second intellectual property being of a different type from said first

intellectual property (see disclosure that the system supports the analysis of different types of intellectual property information, such as patents, trademarks, copyrights, trade secrets, etc., col. 1, lines 16-22; see also col. 10, lines 34-40; see also col. 11, line 63 through col. 12, line 7);

c) searching said first database to identify said pieces of first intellectual property having predetermined characteristics in common with the reference piece of intellectual property (see disclosure of the identification of a 'source grouping' of intellectual property information, col. 8, lines 17-28; see also designation of a 'source grouping', col. 10, lines 34-45);

d) developing without user input at least one query based on at least a portion of said first characteristics of said identified pieces of first intellectual property (see disclosure of the use of a source grouping to generate a list of 'different elements' found in the source grouping, col. 8, line 56 through col. 9, line 15; see also col. 10, line 61 through col. 11, line 39; see also col. 11, line 63 through col. 12, line 29 );

e) searching said second database to identify said pieces of second intellectual property satisfying said at least one query (see disclosure that the created 'field of search' can be used as a search query to be executed by a local or remote database, col. 12, lines 26-29; see also disclosure that the invention

can be used to variously search and/or analyze information related to any form of intellectual property, including patents and trademarks, col. 12, lines 30-42); and

- f) transmitting information related to said identified pieces of second intellectual property to the user (see disclosure that other modules may be included that, among other things, output the results achieved through operation of the search server, col. 2, lines 7-11).

11. Regarding claim 2, Lee additionally teaches a method for investigating intellectual property wherein said pieces of first intellectual property are selected from the group consisting of registered trademarks, unregistered trademarks and applications to register trademarks (see disclosure that the invention can be used to variously search and/or analyze information related to any form of intellectual property, including patents and trademarks, col. 12, lines 30-42).

12. Regarding claims 3 and 5, Lee additionally teaches a method for investigating intellectual property wherein said pieces of second intellectual property are selected from the group consisting of patents and patent applications (see disclosure that the

invention can be used to variously search and/or analyze information related to any form of intellectual property, including patents and trademarks, col. 12, lines 30-42).

13. Regarding claims 4 and 6, Lee additionally teaches a method for investigating intellectual property wherein the reference piece of intellectual property is a trademark (see disclosure of the receipt of input data or signals from the user identifying select intellectual property to form a 'source grouping' of intellectual property information, col. 8, lines 17-28; see also the fact that the intellectual property information can include trademarks, col. 8, lines 11-17).

14. Regarding claim 7, Lee additionally teaches a method for investigating intellectual property wherein said step of searching said first database includes searching said first database to identify said pieces of first intellectual property which are identical matches to the reference piece of intellectual property (see disclosure that the select intellectual property information input by the user may be individual intellectual property identified by native indicia, which would include identifying trademarks which identically matched an input native indicia, col. 8, lines 30-34).



15. Regarding claim 8, **Lee** additionally teaches a method for investigating intellectual property wherein said step of searching said first database includes searching said first database to identify said pieces of first intellectual property which include at least one search term in common with at least a portion of the reference piece of intellectual property (see disclosure that the select intellectual property information input by the user may be individual intellectual property identified by native indicia, which would include identifying trademarks which have, for instance, a common assignee, col. 8, lines 30-34).

16. Regarding claim 9, **Lee** additionally teaches a method for investigating intellectual property further comprising sorting said identified pieces of first intellectual property (see disclosure of the sorting of search results, col. 4, lines 49-57 et seq.).

17. Regarding claim 10, **Lee** additionally teaches a method for investigating intellectual property wherein said step of sorting includes comparing each of said identified pieces of first intellectual property with the reference piece of intellectual property to determine degree of similarity therebetween (see disclosure of the sorting of search results based upon relevancy or weighted relevancy, col. 4, lines 49-57 et seq.).

18. Regarding claim 11, Lee additionally teaches a method for investigating intellectual property wherein said steps of developing at least one query and searching said second database are sequentially conducted for each identified piece of first intellectual property (see disclosure that each piece of intellectual property in the source grouping is reviewed in order to ascertain different elements to be used as search criteria, col. 8, lines 56-63; see also col. 10, line 61 through col. 11, line 2; see also col. 11, line 63 through col. 12, line 7; also note that for at least the cases where none or exactly one piece of first intellectual property is identified, the execution of said developing step and searching step is de facto sequential).

19. Regarding claim 12, Lee additionally teaches a method for investigating intellectual property wherein one of said first characteristics includes the name of the owner of the associated said piece of first intellectual property, and wherein said at least one query includes a first query, said first query being to identify all pieces of second intellectual property in which the owner of the respective said identified piece of first intellectual property has rights (see disclosure that the search engine performs searches based on input data such as Inventor and Assignee, col. 4, lines 15-29).

20. Regarding claim 13, Lee additionally teaches a method for investigating intellectual property wherein said first query being to identify all pieces of second intellectual property in which the owner of the respective said identified piece of intellectual property has recorder ownership rights (see disclosure that the search engine performs searches based on input data such as Inventor and Assignee, col. 4, lines 15-29).

21. Regarding claim 14, Lee additionally teaches a method for investigating intellectual property wherein one of said first characteristics includes the goods or services of the associated said piece of first intellectual property, and wherein said at least one query includes a second query, said second query being to identify all said pieces of second intellectual property which relate to the goods or services of the respective said identified piece of first intellectual property (see disclosure that the intellectual property can be searched based on classification, including the classification of goods and services for trademarks, col. 6, lines 35-56).

22. Regarding claim 15, Lee additionally teaches a method for investigating intellectual property wherein one of said first characteristics includes information relating to dates of first use of the associated said piece of first intellectual property, and

wherein said at least one query includes a third query, said third query being to identify all said pieces of second intellectual property having a filing date or priority date after the dates of first use of the respective said identified piece of first intellectual property (see disclosure that the search engine performs searches based on input data such as Publication Date, Filing Date, Related Data and Priority Data, col. 4, lines 15-29).

23. Regarding claim 16, Lee additionally teaches a method for investigating intellectual property wherein one of said first characteristics includes a classification of the associated said piece of first intellectual property, and wherein said at least one query includes a fourth query, said fourth query being to identify all said pieces of second intellectual property having a classification equivalent to the classification of the respective said identified piece of first intellectual property (see disclosure that the search engine performs searches based on input data such as International Classification, U.S. Classification, and Cross-Reference Classification, col. 4, lines 15-29).

#### *Response to Arguments*

24. Applicant's arguments filed 15 September 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

25. Regarding the Applicant's argument that the **Lee** reference fails to teach the development of a query based on a portion of said first characteristics of said identified pieces of second intellectual property without the user's involvement, the examiner respectfully disagrees.

**Lee** discloses at col. 11, lines 23-26 and 35-39, as well as col. 12, lines 19-22 and 26-29, the fact that a query based upon characteristics of identified pieces of intellectual property can be developed automatically.

Furthermore, regarding the issue of whether said query is *executed* without the user's involvement (a limitation which has not yet been argued or claimed by the Applicant), the examiner points out that at col. 12, lines 26-29, **Lee** discloses that the field-of-search [created from the characteristics of identified pieces of intellectual property] can form a search query to be executed by a local or remote database.

**Lee** also discloses that the disclosed "user" of the system may be (among other things) a device, system or module, col. 13, line 63 through col. 14, line 2).

*Conclusion*

26. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Luke S. Wassum whose telephone number is 571-272-4119. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:30, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John R. Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

In addition, INFORMAL or DRAFT communications may be faxed directly to the examiner at 571-273-4119. Such communications must be clearly marked as INFORMAL, DRAFT or UNOFFICIAL.

Customer Service for Tech Center 2100 can be reached during regular business hours at (571) 272-2100, or fax (571) 273-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
Luke S. Wassum  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2167

lsw  
19 October 2006